

Message

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=9D441DDB44AC4ED486058D2C2690B977-HODGKISS, MIRANDA]
Sent: 8/27/2018 5:33:27 PM
To: Henderson, Lara (ECY) [lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV]; Mann, Laurie [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=91d9977275924e7b80a6751941c1c3b7-Mann, Laurie]
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab
Attachments: WA Changes_OpenSeason 8-27.xlsx

Hi Lara,

Great, thanks! Good catch on the bacteria thing, I forgot to change that N/A after copying over your changes from the WA Accurate tab. I've fixed those, and noted in the justification column that the correct parameter should be bacteria. I'm curious, for the next cycle, will WA be listing for E. coli or fecal coliform instead of bacteria?

As I was making that fix, I noticed something in the parameter column I hadn't caught before. Some of them say 'No data to generate listing ID.' Since we are limited to using something from the drop-down menu, should I also select N/A for those? Or is there another parameter that should be there?

And yes, Miranda C. was referring to the new ATTAINS database. That is good to know you are working on the new TMDL database to flow to ATTAINS. Will WA also flow assessment data to ATTAINS?

Miranda Hodgkiss
Office of Water and Watersheds
U.S. EPA Region 10
(206) 553-0692
hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov

From: Henderson, Lara (ECY) [mailto:lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV]
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2018 2:55 PM
To: Hodgkiss, Miranda <Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>; Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Miranda,

I've had a chance to review the spreadsheet (8-21 v2)-thanks again so much for putting this all together! Not anything critical that I noticed needs changing. I did make a general observation and have a question.

What I noticed in the Changes tab was Bacteria parameters have a notification in their cells (little green triangle in upper right corner). This is because I remember Laurie mentioning that Bacteria was not in the EPA HQ pick list for parameters and they had advised using N/A instead. I'm not sure if using Bacteria vs. N/A would cause any issue, but I thought I'd point that out.

My question is regarding the project names and adding them in later. You quoted Miranda C. as saying: '*Action Report Name/plan name will be tracked in the new system...*' and I was curious if she's referring to the ATTAINS database when she says 'new system'? If so, I'm not sure if you're aware, but we're developing a TMDL database here at Ecology from a grant agreement we received from EPA some time ago. One of the requirements of the grant agreement is that we flow data to ATTAINS. I'm not worried about adding the project names later since we have all of that information, but wanted to let you know that we'll be planning to

flow that data (and more, essentially anything that's a required field in the ATTAINS Action tab) into ATTAINS from our database once it's developed. The deadline for completing our database is May 2019, barring any unforeseen issues and subsequent extension. I just wanted to give you a heads up if the 'new system' is indeed ATTAINS since she says you (or the state).

Other than that, everything looks great to me and again, I really appreciate all of your hard work reviewing, correcting, and editing the spreadsheet! Let me know if you need anything else from me and I'll get it to you.

Sincerely,

Lara

Lara Henderson, Water Quality

TMDL & Nonpoint Programs Technical Support Specialist

Department of Ecology, Headquarters

(360) 407-7656

lara.henderson@ecy.wa.gov

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda [<mailto:Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 9:56 AM

To: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>; Henderson, Lara (ECY) <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>

Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Sorry to spam your inbox again – hopefully this is the last time! I'm attaching a corrected version ('8-21 v2'). There were **23 unmappable segments**. I have not had a chance to update the WA Accurate or WA tabs to reflect that. But I wanted to get you this before I head to my meeting. The Changes tab is the most important one to review.

Thanks so much.

Miranda Hodgkiss

Office of Water and Watersheds

U.S. EPA Region 10

(206) 553-0692

hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda

Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 9:38 AM

To: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>; 'Henderson, Lara (ECY)' <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>

Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

And I forgot to attach the updated spreadsheet with the unmappable segments removed. There were actually 26 – I counted incorrectly before.

Thanks,

Miranda Hodgkiss

Office of Water and Watersheds

U.S. EPA Region 10

(206) 553-0692

hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 9:22 AM
To: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>; 'Henderson, Lara (ECY)' <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Lara,

I heard back from HQ, and they are advising you remove those 14 unmappable AUs for now.

Also, the HQ template does not include plan name. I asked Miranda C. about this and here's what she said:

Action Report Name/plan name will be tracked in the new system but is not needed for measures processing. You (or the state) will have to enter these names into the system separate from the Open Season effort.

So it looks like we'll have to enter this info again at a later date. Apologies for the double work!

Just let me know once you've had a chance to review the spreadsheet and if you notice anything that needs correcting. We have to submit by next Friday, 8/31 but I am out of the office after 8/29. So if you could let me know by 8/28 that would be great.

Thanks!

Miranda Hodgkiss
Office of Water and Watersheds
U.S. EPA Region 10
(206) 553-0692
hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2018 4:22 PM
To: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>; Henderson, Lara (ECY) <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Ok great! I'm attaching your revised spreadsheet. What we had to do in order to switch over from Listing ID to AU ID was a two-step process. First, we removed all Listing ID's from the universe. Then, we added back in all of the waters from your 'WA Accurate' tab with the AU IDs, and including the changes/corrections we've discussed. So the tab you should review is 'Changes.' The Justification for Change column will help you distinguish waters that were removed/added to update the AU ID vs. project priority changes.

Another useful tab to review is the 'WA' tab, which is the original universe Ecology submitted to us, and I've color coded removals (red) and waters that we are keeping (blue).

I have removed those Deschutes listings, as we do not plan to develop TMDLs for them. To give you the simple explanation - there was a 2015 submittal letter (what we count as the official submittal that needs to be acted on) and then Ecology gave us a supplemental submittal in 2017, which included extra listing IDs that weren't in the original.

I have put your reason in there under Justification for Change. I think it is good, and if HQ wants more info we can give it to them in the future.

I counted the unmappable ones and there are 14. Given that we are switching over to tracking with AU IDs, my advice would be to remove them from the priorities for now. We can try to add them back in at some point in the future once the GIS data is sorted out. Unless HQ has a way that they could use some sort of placeholder to keep them as priorities

until the GIS is fixed. I'll ask Miranda C. at HQ, but she's not back in until tomorrow. For now they are in the spreadsheet, but I will touch base with you once I hear back from Miranda about the possibility of leaving them in or going ahead and removing them.

Thanks!

Miranda Hodgkiss
Office of Water and Watersheds
U.S. EPA Region 10
(206) 553-0692
hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov

From: Mann, Laurie
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2018 12:13 PM
To: Henderson, Lara (ECY) <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Hodgkiss, Miranda <Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Lara,
A quick correction to your email: Lower White River has not been completed, and is not waiting for EPA approval (but Pend Oreille is!).
Thanks to both of you for your work on this!
Laurie

From: Henderson, Lara (ECY) [<mailto:lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>]
Sent: Monday, August 20, 2018 11:44 AM
To: Hodgkiss, Miranda <Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>
Cc: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Miranda,

If you think the Deschutes TMDLs that EPA is going to develop will be complete by 2022, I say leave them in. We have a few projects in WQ27 that are in that boat of hinging on approval (i.e. Pend Oreille, White River) but are not currently being worked on. The regions were pretty firm with leaving those in so we could get credit under the measure so Ben and I decided to leave those in and I think the same should apply to the disapproved Deschutes TMDLs that EPA will be working on.

Regarding the Listing IDs, I wrote in comments below. Also, I answered your other questions below.

Thanks again so much!!

Sincerely,
Lara

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda [<mailto:Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2018 3:15 PM
To: Henderson, Lara (ECY) <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Cc: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Lara,

EPA is going to be developing the disapproved Deschutes TMDLs. They should, barring any unforeseen roadblocks, be done by 2022. So given that, I'm happy to keep them in as a priority – I just didn't know if you would want to prioritize something that is no longer in Ecology's wheelhouse. Let me know either way.

And regarding Deschutes, I found the following Listing IDs highlighted by you as belonging to the Deschutes TMDLs. However, they were not part of Ecology's submittal to us. So, there have not been approved TMDLs, nor is EPA planning to develop TMDLs for the following Listing IDs. Should I keep them or remove them?

16722 (in 2017 letter, but not original official submittal)-I don't have all of the documentation so I'm not sure what it means when it's not in official submittal but is in the 2017 letter. If EPA disapproved this, and is not going to develop a TMDL for it, I would say removal is the best option.

45731 (in 2017 letter, but not original official submittal)-Same story here, I don't have all of the documentation so I'm not sure what it means to not be in the official submittal but is in the 2017 letter. If EPA disapproved this, and is not going to develop a TMDL for it, I would say removal is the best option.

47653-if EPA is not going to develop a TMDL for this listing, it should be removed.

47757 (in TMDL document, but not official submittal letter)-sorry again, but I don't know what it means if this listing is in the TMDL document but not in the official submittal letter. I'd say the same, if this was a disapproved listing and EPA is not going to develop a TMDL for it, then it should be removed.

And I had a couple more questions as I'm wrapping things up:

What would you like me to put as the rationale for the listings you removed, and for the listings you added? It can be something generic that applies across the board if that makes it easier. I'd say "project priority changes" or something along those lines if you think that would be appropriate.

Is it ok if I put your name as the contact person?-Yes. Ben is out today so I'll ask him tomorrow if he wants a different name but I assume he'll want me as the contact person.

I haven't checked the GIS data yet, but I noticed that some of the new AUs didn't have an ID associated with them and said they were 'unmappable.' Given that there is no way to link them to the GIS data, and we don't have a new AU ID, I'm not sure how to proceed. I don't think HQ will be able to process those priorities. Do you know about the 'unmappable' designation? What should I do with those AUs?-I've asked assessment staff and found out that the 'unmappable' AUs are generally linked to irrigation ditches and that we know where they are, we just don't have the NHD linework yet. What we are doing is using the 'unmappable' designation as a placeholder until we get a reachcode and apparently our GIS unit has developed many of these reachcodes but they won't have an official AU until the next assessment is approved. Sounds like that won't be for another year or so. They should have listing IDs that would be mappable, however. But...the other option is to remove them since it sounds like a difficult situation and also because they are likely irrigation ditches, it will be very hard to ever get water to meet standards. I can't remember how many, it seemed like only a handful and if that's the case, I'd make an argument for just removing them. Let me know your thoughts and hopefully that helps somewhat.

Keep me posted with any other questions you may have and I'll get back to you asap.

Thanks again so much!

Thanks,

Miranda Hodgkiss
Office of Water and Watersheds
U.S. EPA Region 10
(206) 553-0692

hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov

From: Henderson, Lara (ECY) [<mailto:lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 10:44 AM
To: Hodgkiss, Miranda <Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>
Cc: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Miranda,

I would say you are correct as far as the removing the disapproved Deschutes listings. I thought I had heard something about EPA having to take action on the disapproved listings/parameters so that's why I wasn't sure whether or not to remove them if they were going to be readdressed at some point. However, I do not know the process and believe you and Laurie to be the experts here so if the disapproved Deschutes are not going to be addressed before 2022, yes, they should be in the removals. And yes again, leave in the approved ones.

Thanks again for double checking my work and giving me time to make the fixes-much appreciated! Thanks for sharing the final version with me before it goes to EPA HQ. Keep me posted.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Lara

*Lara Henderson, Water Quality
TMDL & Nonpoint Programs Technical Support Specialist
Department of Ecology, Headquarters
(360) 407-7656
lara.henderson@ecy.wa.gov*

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda [<mailto:Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 9:51 AM
To: Henderson, Lara (ECY) <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Cc: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Great, thanks Lara! No worries about the errors – it's really a lot to keep track of and the spreadsheet isn't the most user friendly.

I will go through this today and get things ready to submit to HQ, but will share with you for one last review before I do.

I guess I should have asked sooner – I am assuming for the Deschutes TMDL listings that we *disapproved*, you want me to remove those from your priorities? And leave in all of the ones that were *approved*?

Thanks,

Miranda Hodgkiss
Office of Water and Watersheds
U.S. EPA Region 10
(206) 553-0692
hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov

From: Henderson, Lara (ECY) [<mailto:lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 3:53 PM
To: Hodgkiss, Miranda <Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>
Cc: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Miranda,

See my responses below. I'm super thankful you reviewed this and apologize for the mistakes!! Not sure where my mind was...looks like several of the missing additions were from either the South Skagit Bay project or the Hangman DO/pH so that was definitely an oversight on my part. I had to do some research for the removals and some were listings with boundary issues that I incorrectly deleted from my tracking spreadsheet at some unknown time and others are just mysteries and I'm not sure why I removed them (I'm theorizing it was a parameter issue but I shouldn't have deleted them regardless)...

As far as the additions that were already part of the current priority universe and the removals that weren't in the current priority universe, I made a comment below that I'm inclined to remove them since they aren't actually removals or additions from the current priority universe (WA tab)

Thanks so much for catching my errors!!! Let me know if you need anything more from me related to this spreadsheet. Keep me posted on the GIS data and let me know if you need anything from my end and I'll get it to you asap.

Sincerely,

Lara

*Lara Henderson, Water Quality
TMDL & Nonpoint Programs Technical Support Specialist
Department of Ecology, Headquarters
(360) 407-7656
lara.henderson@ecy.wa.gov*

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda [<mailto:Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2018 6:45 PM
To: Henderson, Lara (ECY) <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Cc: Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Lara,

Thanks for providing that information. I am working on the assumption that the WA-Accurate tab reflects what you want your *new* priority universe to be (the WA tab reflects the *current* priority universe), and I am trying to sort out what additions and removals to go with. I flagged the following discrepancies in the spreadsheet, and am hoping you can help me resolve them. There is no need to go back into your spreadsheet to fix things – I can do it on my end. If you wouldn't mind taking a look at each of the lists below, and letting me know the answer to the question that goes with the list, I'd appreciate it. After this, I will go through and double-check the Deschutes listings, make sure we submit changes to reflect the new AU ID, and check the GIS data. I will send you a final spreadsheet before we give it to HQ. Thanks!

These were in the WA-Accurate tab but they were not listed as additions. Since they were not in the WA tab, **please verify that you want these additions to the new priority universe and I will make sure they are added.**

41985-yes, please add

53165-yes, please add
 53166-yes, please add
 53167-yes, please add
 53168-yes, please add
 53169-yes, please add
 53170-yes, please add
 53181-yes, please add
 53197-yes, please add
 53198-yes, please add
 53199-yes, please add
 53200-yes, please add
 5850-??It's a Deschutes listing for pH??
 70425-yes, please add
 73349-yes, please add
 77827-yes, please add
 77828-yes, please add

These were in the WA tab, but not in the WA-Accurate tab. However, they were not listed as removals. **Please verify that these should be removals from the current priority universe and I will make sure they are removed.**

11226-yes, please remove
 16101-yes, please remove
 35354-yes, please remove
 35358-yes, please remove
 40588-yes, please remove
 45317-yes, please remove
 45829-yes, please remove
 48437-yes, please remove
 48438-yes, please remove
 50669-yes, please remove
 50670-yes, please remove
 50675-yes, please remove
 61005-yes, please remove
 72448-yes, please remove

73580-NO, please add into the WA Accurate tab (I missed this one and the next for the Moxee Drain Temperature STI)
 see my table for a hopefully easy copy/paste

Region	State	Baseline Cycle	Assessment Unit ID	AU Name (Waterbody Name)	Cause Name	Plan Type	Plan Name	Pollutant
10	WA	2012	17030003000772	UNNAMED DITCH (TRIB TO MOXEE DRAIN)	TEMPERATURE	Alternative	Moxee Drain Temperature STI	
10	WA	2012	17030003003945	HUBBARD CANAL	TEMPERATURE	Alternative	Moxee Drain Temperature STI	

73582- NO, please add into the WA Accurate tab, see above table
 7373-yes, please remove
 7374-yes, please remove
 74037-yes, please remove
 74038-yes, please remove
 74270-NO, please add into the WA Accurate tab, see below table

Region	State	Baseline Cycle	Assessment Unit ID	AU Name (Waterbody Name)	Cause Name	Plan Type	Plan Name	Pollutant	EPA Action Date	List ID
10	WA	2012	UNMAPPABLE-DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT #24-13N-18E-36	DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT #24	BACTERIA	TMDL	Mid Yakima Basin Bacteria TMDL			742
10	WA	2012	Unmappable - DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT #40 (13N-18E-27)	DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT #40	BACTERIA	TMDL	Mid Yakima Basin Bacteria TMDL			742
10	WA	2012	Unmappable - UNNAMED DITCH (TRIB TO MOXEE DRAIN)-12N-19E-11	UNNAMED DITCH (TRIB TO MOXEE DRAIN)	BACTERIA	TMDL	Mid Yakima Basin Bacteria TMDL			742

74271- NO, please add into the WA Accurate tab, see above table

74276- NO, please add into the WA Accurate tab, see above table

7591-yes, please remove (this was a Deschutes listing that was rolled up into 48718)

8346-yes, please remove

8347-yes, please remove

9616-yes, please remove

9621-yes, please remove

9629-yes, please remove

9631-yes, please remove

9632-yes, please remove

These were listed as removals but they are not in the WA tab (i.e. not part of your current priority universe). **This is an FYI that they don't need to be removed since they aren't current priorities. No need to respond unless you no longer want them as removals.** Sorry about the confusion here! If these weren't part of the current priority universe (WA tab), I would be inclined to remove them from the removals to avoid confusion...but that's just my opinion. I'd put you as the expert in this scenario.

45115

45219

46164

46346

46628

46633

46645

46673

6718

73581

73591

8306

3323

These were listed as additions, but they are already in the WA tab (i.e. already part of your current priority universe). **This is an FYI that they don't need to be added since they are already priorities. No need to respond unless you no longer want them as priorities.** Sorry about the confusion here! Same as above, you can do what you think is the best but I would be inclined to remove them from additions since they weren't technically additions.

11173
11174
16722
3769
45731
47370
47395
47653
47757
48455
48467
48649
48650
48656
49025
49027
49028
5852
5853
5863
5864
66747
70800
72949
73587
7582
7584
8307

From: Henderson, Lara (ECY) [<mailto:lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>]
Sent: Thursday, August 9, 2018 2:31 PM
To: Hodgkiss, Miranda <Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>; Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Cc: Rau, Ben (ECY) <benr461@ECY.WA.GOV>; mgil461@ECY.WA.GOV
Subject: [WARNING: UNSCANNABLE EXTRACTION FAILED]RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Miranda,

I answered your questions below...

From: Hodgkiss, Miranda [<mailto:Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 3:14 PM
To: Henderson, Lara (ECY) <lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>; Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Lara,

Laurie and I talked with HQ today and we should have a path forward using the information you provided. Before we submit this to HQ though, I want to make sure you have included all the changes in the spreadsheet that you wanted. If so, just let me know and I will move forward.

I'm confident with the changes made other than the Deschutes TMDL (listings for disapproved parameters)- see my elaborated responses below.

To make sure I understand what changes you made, I had a couple of questions...

The WA-Accurate tab includes all additions and removals, correct?

The WA-Accurate tab has all of the assessment units and listing IDs that are going to be tracked by our CURRENT priority projects. It contains additions but does not contain removals. The WA-Accurate tab was intended to be a way to track AUs/listings we are going to address through WQ-27 so I removed all the listings that aren't going to be addressed via our priorities. The removals are contained within the Changes tab. All of the information I used to fill out the Changes tab (additions/removals) is contained within the many-tabbed spreadsheet I sent to you and Laurie on June 1. Essentially, all the strikethroughs on that spreadsheet became my removals and everything I had color-coded blue were my additions.

On the Changes tab, you highlighted some cells – what should we do with those? It looks like orange cells are related to Deschutes – what exactly should I be verifying for those? Regarding the orange cells, I made a note in the 'Lara's Notes' tab. Since I put this whole list together, I was hoping that you could handle the Deschutes listings for the parameters that weren't approved by EPA (bacteria, DO and pH). From what I understand, EPA needs to take action on the other unapproved listings within a certain timeframe so I don't know if it would be appropriate to move them to the removals list? I thought that would be a mystery you could solve. Also be aware that all of the Deschutes listings are still in my WA-Accurate tab since there hadn't been an approval/disapproval when I sent the first revised draft spreadsheet over June 1. I went ahead and highlighted in orange all the Deschutes listings for parameters other than temperature in the WA-Accurate tab as well, since what to do with those are a mystery to me.

Did you find out what parameter you'd like to use for the yellow cells? Yes I have fixed those, they were supposed to be DDT Metabolites so those are fixed and I attached a new spreadsheet (with a date so it's not too confusing hopefully). I also added Assessment Unit IDs to the Changes tab in Column N for reference if needed, but only for the additions (I didn't think it would be necessary for the removals since they are now removed, but if you'd like those, I can provide them as well).

Also, for the GIS data, we will be able to use the GIS data you provided the link to. Can you verify that the AU IDs in the GIS data match up exactly with the ones you provided in the spreadsheet?

The data I sent you a link for is the 2014 303(d) list and 305(b) report. I can't be 100% sure if that matches the listing IDs, but it should match the Assessment Unit IDs I provided in the spreadsheet. Once you download the data, I would hope that you could see if there are serious issues. If that were the case, you could let me know and I could come up with a solution if needed.

Thanks,

Miranda Hodgkiss
Office of Water and Watersheds
U.S. EPA Region 10
(206) 553-0692

hodgkiss.miranda@epa.gov

From: Henderson, Lara (ECY) [<mailto:lboy461@ECY.WA.GOV>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 7, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Hodgkiss, Miranda <Hodgkiss.Miranda@epa.gov>; Mann, Laurie <mann.laurie@epa.gov>
Subject: [WARNING: UNSCANNABLE EXTRACTION FAILED]WQ27 spreadsheet with Changes tab

Hi Miranda and Laurie,

Attached is the most current spreadsheet. Please see my notes tab for explanation of anything additional in the sheet.

I am out of the office tomorrow but will be back on Thursday. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Lara

*Lara Henderson, Water Quality
TMDL & Nonpoint Programs Technical Support Specialist
Department of Ecology, Headquarters
(360) 407-7656
lara.henderson@ecy.wa.gov*